

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/630,517	BERNARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee	1714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee. (3) _____
 (2) Mr. Dennis Carmen. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 October 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 19-70.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of LAN.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner initially contacted the applicant's representative with request for examiner's amendment, which would incorporated oxygen scavenging systems into independent claims, so that new prior art of LAN can be overcome. The applicant's representative authorized examiner to cancel claims 30-70. Discussed was also rejoinder of previously restricted claims 19-29. The examiner first clarified that claim 1 recites all one composition. The examiner then indicated that the claims will not be rejoined, since none of the layers of the article in claim 19 fully recite allowable subject matter. The applicant's representative therefore authorized cancellation of restricted claims 19-29. Since this interview results in application being in condition for allowance, no response from the applicant is necessary.